ATTACHMENT 4

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
           FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
                    SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4
      IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL
5
6
      ROBOT ANTITRUST LITIGATION
 7
      THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL
8
      CASES
      SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE ) Case No.
9
                                  ) 3:21-cv-03496-VC
10
      COMPANY, INC.,
                  Plaintiff,
11
              v.
12
      INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
13
                  Defendants.
14
15
             REMOTE VIDEO RECORDED DEPOSITION OF
16
17
                       JUDITH SCHIMMEL
18
                 Thursday, September 22, 2022
19
20
21
     REPORTED BY:
22
     RENEE HARRIS, CSR, CCR, RPR
23
      JOB NO. 5490761
24
     PAGES: 1 - 159
25
                                                Page 1
```

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
4			
5	IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL)		
6	ROBOT ANTITRUST LITIGATION)		
7)		
8	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL)		
9	CASES)		
10)		
11	SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE) Case No.		
12	COMPANY, INC.,) 3:21-cv-03496-VC		
13	Plaintiff,)		
14	v.)		
15	INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,)		
16	Defendants.)		
17)		
18			
19	Remote Videotaped Deposition of JUDITH		
20	SCHIMMEL, the witness herein, at 10:08 a.m. EDT,		
21	on Thursday, September 22, 2022, before Renee		
22	Harris, California Certified Shorthand Reporter		
23	No. 14168, New Jersey Certified Court Reporter No.		
24	30XI00241200 and Registered Professional Reporter.		
25			
	Page 2		
	rage 2		

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	
3	CO-LEAD COUNSEL FOR THE PROPOSED CLASS:
4	COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC
5	BY: MANUEL J. DOMINGUEZ, ESQ.
6	11780 U.S. Highway One, Suite N500
7	Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408
8	(561) 515-2604
9	jdominguez@cohenmilstein.com
10	-AND-
11	BY: ZACH GLUBIAK, ESQ.
12	1100 New York Ave., Suite 500
13	Washington, DC 20005
14	(202) 408-4600
15	zglubiak@cohenmilstein.com
16	
17	FOR DEFENDANT DEFENDANT INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.:
18	COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
19	BY: ISAAC D. CHAPUT, ESQ.
20	MARIAM AZHAR, ESQ.
21	415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
22	San Francisco, California 94105-2533
23	(415) 591-6000
24	ichaput@cov.com
25	mazhar@cov.com
	Page 3

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)
2	
3	HALEY GULLIANO LLP
4	BY: GREGORY LUNDELL, ESQ.
5	111 North Market Street, Suite 900
6	San Jose, California 95114
7	(669) 213-1050
8	greg.lundell@hglaw.com
9	
10	Also Present:
11	Bobby Amick, ESQ., In-House Counsel,
12	Hospital Plaintiffs
13	Scott Slater, Videographer
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 4

1	agreement.	
2	BY MR. CHAPUT:	
3	Q. Okay. So if, you know, for example,	
4	tomorrow, Franciscan were to request a transaction	
5	agreement for a new robot purchase, you would	12:37:14
6	agree you would review that transaction	
7	agreement; correct?	
8	A. Correct.	
9	Q. Did you review transaction agreements	
10	between 2020 and March of 2021 when the Dyer	12:37:28
11	agreement was entered into?	
12	A. I have only reviewed this particular	
13	document. I have not reviewed any previous	
14	transaction documents.	
15	Q. You can set that document aside. Thank	12:37:42
16	you.	
17	So we had talked some about the	
18	procurement process earlier, and I'd just like to	
19	briefly understand a little bit more about that	
20	process.	12:38:09
21	So could you please walk me through	
22	before Franciscan had the master agreement, what	
23	would the procurement process be for a hospital	
24	that wanted to purchase a da Vinci robot?	
25	A. So speaking from my director days, we	12:38:29
		Page 103

1	would identify a need for procuring either a robot	
2	or a second robot. We would have to have a	
3	request for that, and have documentation for	
4	reasoning, for needing a robot or a second robot;	
5	that, in turn, requests would be taken forward and	12:38:53
6	our finance department would assist in developing	
7	a return on investment and a portfolio pro forma	
8	so that we could make the presentation to our	
9	corporate senior leaders for the funding.	
10	And then if that funding based on that	12:39:23
11	request was approved, then the facility was	
12	approved for purchase.	
13	Q. So at the first step, identifying the	
14	need for a robot, who would identify that need?	
15	A. So from my previous experience, it would	12:39:53
16	be myself, Intuitive, physicians looking at our	
17	availability of time and the ability to schedule	
18	procedures.	
19	Q. Would you also look at overall case	
20	volume of surgeries that were being performed	12:40:28
21	let me rephrase this question.	
22	Would you also look at the overall volume	
23	of the procedures that were being performed,	
24	whether a laparoscopic or open modality are also	
25	robotic modality?	12:40:53
		Page 104

1	A. Not in identifying the need.	
2	Q. And why wouldn't you look at that in	
3	identifying the need?	
4	A. Because that's not that wasn't based	
5	on any criteria. You would not look at that in	12:41:06
6	identifying the need for a second robot; that	
7	would be part of a pro forma.	
8	Q. Okay. So you you would consider that	
9	in the return on investment analysis; is that	
10	correct?	12:41:25
11	A. Correct.	
12	Q. Okay. And so when you when you	
13	document the reasons for the request, is that the	
14	same as that need that you were just describing of	
15	looking at the availability of robot time and the	12:41:40
16	ability to schedule robotic surgeries?	
17	A. As well as a physician request.	
18	Q. So then you mentioned that the request	
19	goes forward to the finance department who helps	
20	develop an ROI portfolio.	12:42:08
21	What's included in the ROI portfolio?	
22	A. Typically cost of equipment, all service	
23	costs, disposable costs, instrumentation costs.	
24	So the entire start-up costs.	
25	And then volume, projected volume,	12:42:36
		Page 105

1	reimbursement, and that carries out to five years,	
2	usually.	
3	Q. And in order to get the request approved	
4	by corporate leadership, would this pro forma need	
5	to reflect a positive ROI?	12:43:10
6	A. Doesn't always reflect a positive ROI.	
7	Depending on the number of years, if it needs to	
8	go out five more years or seven or ten, it needs	
9	to reflect the return on investment and what that	
10	would look like.	12:43:36
11	Q. So you said it doesn't always reflect a	
12	positive ROI. Are you do you recall specific	
13	instances where a da Vinci robot purchase did not	
14	reflect a positive ROI in the pro forma, and	
15	corporate senior leadership nonetheless approved	12:43:57
16	the request?	
17	A. I can't speak to anyone other than the	
18	time frame when I brought forth a request to add a	
19	da Vinci robot in our Lafayette campus.	
20	So I can't answer that. I don't know.	12:44:14
21	Q. So I just want to make sure that I'm	
22	understanding.	
23	Are you saying that you only	
24	Franciscan only purchased one da Vinci robot	
25	during your tenure as surgical director at	12:44:29
		Page 106

1	Lafayette?	
2	A. We purchased two: The Si, and then we	
3	added an Xi while I was there several years later.	
4	Q. Okay. And for both of those purchases,	
5	did you follow the process, the procurement	12:44:50
6	process that you explained to me a few minutes	
7	ago?	
8	A. It would have followed the procurement	
9	process. I was not as involved as I was with the	
10	second one.	12:45:02
11	Q. Just so we're clear: You were not	
12	involved in the first purchase as you were with	
13	the second; is that right?	
14	A. I didn't provide as much information on	
15	the first request as the second request.	12:45:14
16	Q. And for those two requests, did the ROI	
17	analysis that the finance department put together	
18	reflect a positive ROI?	
19	A. I don't recall seeing the first pro	
20	forma.	12:45:39
21	The second pro forma, I don't remember.	
22	I can't recall if it was positive or negative. I	
23	don't I can't remember. I would have to look	
24	at it.	
25	Q. Do you expect that the corporate senior	12:46:09
		Page 107

```
1
      STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                              (
                                    Ss.
      COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
 2
                              )
 3
              I, RENEE HARRIS, do hereby certify that I
 4
 5
      am a licensed Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly
      qualified and certified as such by the State of
 6
 7
      California;
         That prior to being examined, the witness named
 8
 9
      in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn
      to testify to tell the truth, the whole truth, and
10
      nothing but the truth;
11
         That the said deposition was by me recorded
12
13
      stenographically;
14
         And the foregoing pages constitute a full,
15
      true, complete and correct record of the testimony
      given by the said witness;
16
              That I am a disinterested person, not
17
      being in any way interested in the outcome of said
18
      action, or connected with, nor related to any of
19
      the parties in said action, or to their respective
      counsel, in any manner whatsoever.
20
2.1
            Dated: October 7, 2022
22
23
24
            Renee Harris, CSR, CCR, RPR
            CA CSR No. 14168,
25
            NJ CRR No. 30XI00241200; RPR
                                                 Page 157
```